

POINT PAPER ON P&L PROPOSAL

BACKGROUND

- Materiel Management Functional Group (FG) established on May 14, 1990.
- OASD(P&L) provided FG leader, Mike Craner.
- The MM FG has two FIMs, Patricia Mitchell and Scarlett Curry.
- The FG has 30 participants from the Services and DLA.
- The P&L Functional Steering Committee approved on August 13, 1990; ASD(P&L) is the designated FSC chairman, but delegated responsibility to DASD (Logistics).
- With functional cognizance over two CIM functional groups, Materiel Management and Distribution Center, the FSC consists of senior functional managers from the DoD Components, the Senior IRM Official, the DC(IRM), and the CIM director.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- Consistent with the above, the OSD functional office plays a leadership role in the CIM process.
- The FSC is chartered to:
 - provide functional policy guidance and strategic objectives to the FGs.
 - review and approve the CIM FG products.
- In accordance with the 10/4/89 DEPSECDEF memo, the CIM Office is responsible for:
 - planning and managing the CIM initiative.
 - putting a structured process in place.
 - ensuring the resultant products adhere to the approved process.

ISSUE AND CONCERNS

- The P&L(L/SD) 11/5/90 memo begs the question, "Who is in charge of CIM process?" In addition, it proposes:
 - An alternative functional oversight body for CIM FGs that excludes CIM participation.
 - A superstructure, with an overall OSD leader, and Component leadership of subgroups (asset management, item introduction, requirements, acquisition logistics, and distribution).
 - A by-exception approach to the CIM process--relying on existing Service documentation.

ANALYSIS OF P&L PROPOSAL

The proposal:

- Is, practically, silent on the chartered role of the P&L Functional Steering Committee (FSC). This omission coupled with the fact that the FSC has not approved the MM CIM Phase I products (completed nearly two months ago), or the Distribution Center Phase I products, gives the appearance of an unwillingness to use this duly chartered body as intended. Prompt approval of products is key to expediting the CIM Process.
- Outlines an approach where "multi-functional" OSD and Component representatives would lead five subgroups with the leaders being members of the CIM Functional Steering Committee. While it's unclear what "multi-functional" means in this context, it is assumed that the subgroups would be along the lines of acquisition MM, item introduction, requirements, asset management, and distribution center operations. Since, currently, only the leaders of the MM CIM and Distribution Center CIM Groups are members of the FSC, this part of the proposal could be construed to mean that: (a) the additional subgroup leaders might be chosen (not clear by whom) from inside the current CIM Groups' membership and given the status of CIM Group leader, (b) the Distribution Center CIM would become a subgroup, and/or (c) yet another management layer would be imposed on the CIM Process. Consistent with the DepSecDef directive, the CIM Groups should be "led by OSD officials."
- Indicates that the Directorate for CIM should focus on products, rather than process. This is a curious thought, since the DepSecDef's memorandum, dated October 4, 1989, charged the Deputy Comptroller (Information Resources Management) with developing a management plan, including a CIM Process Guide. The clear inference is that the DC(IRM) has overall responsibility for planning and managing the CIM process to include putting a structured process in place, and providing reasonable assurance that it is adhered to and quality, documented, and visionary products result from it.
- Purports to have the subgroups following the CIM process guidance. At the same time, the proposal conveys the impression that only in those cases where documentation currently exists will CIM products be prepared. Whether documentation does or does not exist, the proposal does not guarantee that products will be prepared for input to knowledgeware.
- Indicates that the DMMB will resolve and coordinate functional integration and data standardization issues.

Each CIM Group has responsibility for resolving integration and standardization issues. It is only to the extent that these issues cannot be resolved at the Groups' level that they are submitted to the Committees. In any case, integration and standardization must be viewed and managed from a DoD-wide perspective, rather than a limited logistics perspective as conveyed in the proposal.

- Conveys the notion that the Inventory Reduction Plan and Components' improvement initiatives will be the basis for future MM systems -- albeit not necessarily visionary. The issue here is a question of emphasis. Should the focus be on what currently is in existence/planned and these delimit the ten years and beyond systems? Or should the emphasis remain on future functional requirements as well as the goals, objectives and strategies for satisfying these requirements, and to the extent that current/planned initiatives can be employed to support these strategies, then they be used?
- Does not specifically indicate the working relationship between the the MM CIM Group and the Executive Agents (EA). A relationship which calls for Group members to augment the EA staff would be disruptive and divisive to the Group.